

REMARKS

Pursuant to the Office Action, independent claims 1, 10, 17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodman. Claims 1, 10, 17 and 26 were amended. For example, as amended, claim 1 calls for a controller communicatively coupled to an interface, the controller to detect a non-specific key activation and to adjust a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting the key activation, the adjustment of the cursor to minimize inadvertent interruption of user input.

Goodman utilizes a special function key to cause designated "mouse keys" to emulate a mouse. In this way, the specialized keys become the pointing device. In contrast, according to some embodiments of the present invention, a user may use a pointing device to position a cursor. However, when the user begins to type for example, the cursor automatically adjusts or is controlled in a way that will prevent inadvertent interruption of the user's typing should the user accidentally activate the pointing device while typing. Inadvertent activation of a pointing device while typing is quite common in systems that employ a pointing device situated proximate the keyboard. Goodman does not teach any such feature. Thus, claims 1, 10, 17 and 26 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be patentable.

Independent claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Franz. As amended, claim 15 calls for receiving an option to control a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting a non-specific key activation, the control of the cursor to reduce the likelihood of accidental interruption of user input.


Franz also uses a specialized key to act as a pointing device. For example, the "J" key may be coupled to direction sensors to act as a pointing device under certain circumstances. Column 8, lines 46-49. Thus, when in the pointing mode, depression of the "J" key will input pointing information. Like Goodman, Franz does not address cursor control for avoiding accidental interruption of user input by inadvertent activation of the pointing device. Thus, claims 15 and 23 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be patentable.

Application No. 09/846,074
Amendment dated September 30, 2003
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2003

In view of the amendments and remarks above, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly asked to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2003



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906